UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,172	09/25/2006	Weng Sing Tang	ALBAN19.001APC	7749

20995 7590 04/17/2009

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER	
SMITH, BENJAMIN J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/17/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/594,172	TANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin J. Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 September 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/25/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This non-final office action is in response to the Application filed on 9/22/2006, with a priority date of 3/23/2005 from 371 of PCT/SG05/00093.

Claims 1-28 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 24, 25, 27 and 28 are independent claims.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the recited "*computer-readable medium*" of Claim 27. The Specification does not mention the recited "*computer-readable medium.*" Thus, there is no support or antecedent basis for the recited "*computer-readable medium*" that allows the meaning of the term to be ascertained, as required in 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5:

Regarding claim 5, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-23 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1:

In summary, Claim 1 recites a "*platform*" solely comprising multiple design modules. An embodiment of the design modules are simply pieces of software, as described in the Specification (see Specification -- Page 5, Lines 11-17). Thus, for purposes of examination, the examiner interprets the recited "*platform*" to be software per se. That is, the recited "*platform*" is not a process, a machine, a manufacture or a composition of matter.

Accordingly, Claim 1 fails to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 2-23 merely recite additional features of the design modules. Thus, Claims 2-23 do not further define the recited "*platform*" as being within a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.

Accordingly, Claims 2-23 fail to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 28:

Claim 28 are rejected using a similar reasoning to the rejection of Claims 1-23, namely a "*platform"* comprising design modules is software. The examiner notes that each of the recited "means for" limitations appear to involve only computer software modules (see Specification -- Page 5, Lines 11-17). That is, none of the recited "means for" limitations necessarily require a computer hardware component.

Claim 27:

In summary, Claim 27 recites a "*computer-readable medium*". An embodiment of the " *computer-readable medium*" is an electrical or optical (signal or wave), as is commonly defined in the art. The applicant's lack of a definition in the specification requires the examiner to use the broadest reasonable interpretation in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, for purposes of examination, the examiner interprets the recited

"*computer-readable medium*" to be an electrical or optical (signal or wave) per se. That is, the recited "*computer-readable medium*" is not a process, a machine, a manufacture or a composition of matter.

Accordingly, Claim *27* fails to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 10-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poulose et. al. US Patent No. 7,032,170 (hereinafter, "Poulose"), and further in view of Vlad Alexander US Patent Publication No. 2004/0205528 (hereinafter, "Alexander").

Claim 1:

Poulose teaches:

A platform for developing forms, comprising [abstract]:

...

a form design module configured to graphically design reusable forms using the form attributes, the forms having integrated business logic [col. 5, lines 27-37] [GUI to create forms with integrated logic]*; and*

a project design module configured to design reusable projects by graphically arranging the forms according to a predetermined process flow [col. 4, lines 8-24] [creating multiple pages and linking them though a web page is project creation]*; wherein the design modules are configured to operate independently from each other such that the design of the attributes, forms and projects are separate functions, and designed attributes, forms and the projects are stored as separate entities* [col. 5, lines 3-20 and fig. 1] [components of the forms creation and deployment done separately, they are stored in a database that may be in as many different location as the creator desires, templates are also stored separately].

Poulose fails to teach:

an attribute design module configured to graphically design reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated business logic;

Alexander teaches:

an attribute design module configured to graphically design reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated

business logic [paragraph 0040-0041] [element builder is used to create reusable elements for form creation]*;*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of form creation in Poulose with the method of form creation in Alexander.

This combination would have been useful for adding additional form creation and editing abilities to the method and system in Poulose.

Claim 24:

Poulose teaches:

A method Of developing forms, comprising [abstract]*:*

...

graphically designing reusable forms using the form attributes, the forms having integrated business logic [col. 5, lines 27-37] [GUI to create forms with integrated logic]*; and*

designing reusable projects by graphically arranging the forms according to a predetermined process flow [col. 4, lines 8-24] [creating multiple pages and linking them though a web page is project creation]*;*

wherein the design of the attributes, forms and projects are separate functions, and designed attributes, forms and the projects are stored as separate entities [col. 5, lines 3-20 and fig. 1] [components of the forms creation and deployment done

separately, they are stored in a database that may be in as many different location as the creator desires, templates are also stored separately].

Poulose fails to teach:

graphically designing reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated business logic;

Alexander teaches:

graphically designing reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated business logic [paragraph 0040-0041] [element builder is used to create reusable elements for form creation]*;*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of form creation in Poulose with the method of form creation in Alexander.

This combination would have been useful for adding additional form creation and editing abilities to the method and system in Poulose.

Claim 25:

Poulose teaches:

A form developed by a method, wherein the method comprises [abstract]*:*

…

graphically designing reusable forms using the form attributes. the forms having integrated business logic [col. 5, lines 27-37] [GUI to create forms with integrated logic] *and*

designing reusable projects by graphically arranging the forms according to a predetermined process flow [col. 4, lines 8-24] [creating multiple pages and linking them though a web page is project creation]*;*
wherein the design of the attributes, forms and projects are separate functions, and designed attributes, forms and the projects are stored as separate entities [col. 5, lines 3-20 and fig. 1] [components of the forms creation and deployment done separately, they are stored in a database that may be in as many different location as the creator desires, templates are also stored separately]*.*

Poulose fails to teach:

graphically designing reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated business logic;

Alexander teaches:

graphically designing reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated business logic [paragraph 0040-0041] [element builder is used to create reusable elements for form creation]*;*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of form creation in Poulose with the method of form creation in Alexander.

This combination would have been useful for adding additional form creation and editing abilities to the method and system in Poulose.

Claim 27:

Poulose teaches:

A computer-readable medium for carrying computer-executable instructions for [abstract]*:*

...

graphically designing reusable forms using the form attributes, the forms having integrated business logic [col. 5, lines 27-37] [GUI to create forms with integrated logic] *and*

designing reusable projects by graphically arranging the forms according to a predetermined process flow [col. 4, lines 8-24] [creating multiple pages and linking them though a web page is project creation]*;*

wherein the design of the attributes, forms and projects are separate functions, and designed attributes, forms and the projects are stored as separate entities [col. 5, lines 3-20 and fig. 1] [components of the forms creation and deployment done separately, they are stored in a database that may be in as many different location as the creator desires, templates are also stored separately].

Poulose fails to teach:

graphically designing reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated business logic;

Alexander teaches:

graphically designing reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated business logic [paragraph 0040-0041] [element builder is used to create reusable elements for form creation]*;*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of form creation in Poulose with the method of form creation in Alexander.

This combination would have been useful for adding additional form creation and editing abilities to the method and system in Poulose.

Claim 28:

Poulose teaches:

A platform for developing forms, comprising [abstract]:

...

means for graphically designing reusable forms using the form attributes, the forms having integrated business logic [col. 5, lines 27-37] [GUI to create forms with integrated logic] *and*

means for designing reusable projects by graphically arranging the forms according to a predetermined process flow [col. 4, lines 8-24] [creating multiple pages and linking them though a web page is project creation]*;*

wherein the design of the attributes, forms and projects are separate functions, and designed attributes, forms and the projects are stored as separate entities [col. 5, lines 3-20 and fig. 1] [components of the forms creation and deployment done separately, they are stored in a database that may be in as many different location as the creator desires, templates are also stored separately].

Poulose fails to teach:

means for graphically designing reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated business logic;

Alexander teaches:

means for graphically designing reusable form attributes from a selection of predetermined fields, the attributes having integrated business logic [paragraph 0040-0041] [element builder is used to create reusable elements for form creation]*;*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of form creation in Poulose with the method of form creation in Alexander.

This combination would have been useful for adding additional form creation and editing abilities to the method and system in Poulose.

Claim 2:

Poulose and Alexander teach: *The platform according to claim 1, further comprising an attribute library to store designed attributes* [Alexander: paragraph 0011] [stored in a package] *a form library to store designed forms and a project library to store designed projects* [col. 8, lines 34-45] [stored to coordinate data].

Claim 3:

Poulose teaches: *The platform according to claim 1, further comprising a validation engine to validate a form* [col. 4, lines 15-25] [data validation].

Claim 4:

Poulose teaches: *The platform according to claim 3, wherein the form is validated against an open standard or validated against an internal business policy of a business* [col. 6, lines 1-14] [data validation against business policy].

Claim 5:

Poulose teaches: *The platform according to claim 3, wherein the form is validated to comply with a security policy such as checking for SQL or script injection* [col. 4, lines 59-64] [variety of security arrangements, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would include script injection in security policies].

Claim 6:

Poulose teaches: *The platform according to claim 4, wherein the internal business policy is stored in a validation policy repository to facilitate re-usability* [col. 6, lines 1-20] [validation calculation stored in template].

Claim 7:

Poulose teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, further comprising an approval system to enable forms to be approved prior to publishing* [col. 4, lines 25-32] [approved and then deployed].

Claim 8:

Poulose teaches: *The platform according to claim 7, wherein the approval system is a centralized system* [col. 6, lines 43-55] [centralized on a web server accessed through a browser].

Claim 10:

Poulose teaches: The platform according to claims 1, wherein the form is interpreted to generate a form or series of related forms in HTML, wireless markup language (WML) or other language for presentation on a specific device or operating and system [col. 2, lines 9-33] [forms created to be deployed on a web server, web servers serve pages in HTML WML].

Claim 11:

Poulose teaches: The platform according to claims 1, wherein the predetermined fields includes input fields selected from at least one of the following: as text fields, password fields and image fields [col. 5, lines 60-67 and fig. 5] [components listed in fig 5].

Claim 12:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein the attribute designer module specifies validation, error message and dependencies for form controls within an attribute* [paragraph 0049] [specifying the validator class will specify the message that is given].

Claim 13:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein the attributes are hierarchically designed* [paragraph 0046] [hierarchical attributes, it is also noted that

most markup languages are hierarchical in nature thus making their attributes hierarchical].

Claim 14:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claim 13, wherein validation of a form is nested at predetermined levels* [paragraph 0049] [validator class group for nested validation].

Claim 15:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein the form designer module designs page flows* [paragraph 0045] [design flow of a web page].

Claim 16:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein the form designer module specifies validation, error messages and dependencies for attributes, sections and pages within a form* [paragraph 0042 [control and validation of objects].

Claim 17:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein the form designer module specifies list iterators, action types, paging mechanism, perform and post-form processing and form persistence* [paragraph 0089] [control data entry for each data type].

Claim 18:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein backend business services are linked to the predetermined process flow* [paragraph 0076] [content is updated when a template is updated].

Claim 19:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein the form designer module further designs forms with sections and pages* [paragraph 0028 and fig. 2] [content management].

Claim 20:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein the project designer module centrally manages styles, messages, and plugins for a project* [paragraph 0040] [render controller and element builder is used to create reusable elements for form creation].

Claim 21:

Alexander teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein the project designer module specifies list iterators, access control, configurations and a publishing mechanism* [paragraph 30-0031] [authorization and share].

Claim 22:

Poulose teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein business logic contained within designed attributes and forms includes validation rules for form input while data is being entered* [col. 6, lines 1-14] [formula calculator and validation].

Claim 23:

Poulose teaches: *The platform according to claims 1, wherein business logic contained within designed attributes and forms includes equations or calculators to generate a useful result* [col. 6, lines 1-14] [formula calculator and validation].

Claim 26:

Poulose teaches: *The method according to claim 24, further comprising providing a graphical user interface to allow a user to perform the steps of graphically designing reusable form attributes, graphically designing reusable forms and designing reusable* projects [col. 5, lines 3-20 and fig. 1] [components of the forms creation and deployment done separately, they are stored in a database that may be in as many different location as the creator desires, templates are also stored separately].

Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poulose and Alexander as applied to Claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Rhoda Yaker US Patent Publication No. 2002/0090069 (hereinafter, "Yaker"), and further in view of Kelley et. al. US Patent No. 6,247,029 (hereinafter, "Kelley").

Claim 9:

Poulose and Alexander teach all the elements of Claims 1 and 8 as discloses above.

Poulose also teaches:

The platform according to claim 7, wherein the approval system includes:

an inbox configured to allow access to individual forms associated with certain users [Poulose: col. 6, lines 43-68] [the term "inbox" is not specifically used but the same functionality of an "inbox" is present, namely a user know which forms need to be approved and they are notified of such]*;*

...

printing module configured to allow forms to be printed in a printer-friendly format [col. 2, lines 21-33] [a web browser is disclosed and a common feature on web browsers is a "print" option]*;*

export module configured to allow users to export form data in XML or other formats [Alexander: paragraph 0028] [use of other tag delimited languages]*; or*

an administration module configured to allow remote configuration and monitoring of all forms and their associated routing processes [Alexander: paragraphs 0011-0013] [managing of organized content].

Poulose and Alexander fail to teach:

an out-of-office mechanism configured to allow users to indicate an out-of-office status and specify route re-direction or alternative actions;

a forms archive configured to allow forms to be searchable and filtered;

Yaker teaches:

an out-of-office mechanism configured to allow users to indicate an out-of-office status and specify route re-direction or alternative actions [Yaker: paragraphs 0008-0011] ["out-of-office" system with forward messages, "out-of-office" and message forwarding are common elements in workflow management methods]*;*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of form creation in Poulose and Alexander with the method of message forwarding in Yaker.

This combination would have been useful for adding additional form creation and editing and approving abilities to the method and system in Poulose and Alexander.

Poulose, Alexander and Yaker fail to teach:

a forms archive configured to allow forms to be searchable and filtered;

Kelley teaches:

a forms archive configured to allow forms to be searchable and filtered [Kelley: col. 6, lines 63] [search database for forms]*;*

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of form creation in Poulose and Alexander with the method of message forwarding in Yaker and the method of form searching in Kelley.

This combination would have been useful for adding additional form creation, editing, approving and searching abilities to the method and system in Poulose and Alexander.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin J. Smith whose telephone number is (571) 270-3825. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30AM-5:00PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin J. Smith/
Examiner, Art Unit 2176

/DOUG HUTTON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2176